

**To Michael Hoffman about Horst Mahler's initiative
(the founding of a Revisionist ADL)**

Robert Faurisson

Dear Michael,

I have read your message on "The Revisionism of the Future: Human Rights, not Reich". I am surprised you did not see that, when I say "the Jews", it is just as when one says "the Germans", "the Christians", the "Inuits". When one states: "The Americans are constantly at war", it does not mean that an American citizen called Michael Hoffman is currently bombing and killing people. When I say: "I am afraid of the Americans and of the Jews", the words "Americans" and "Jews" are obviously GENERIC terms.

What would you think upon hearing someone state: "From 1914 to 1918, French and Germans were at war" only to hear someone else come back with: "You are wrong, not all the French and not all the Germans were at war; we even know that at times some French soldiers and some German soldiers, disgusted with the war, decided in the trenches to stop killing each other and even struck up a casual friendship"? And what would you think, Michael, of someone putting on simpering airs and adding to the conversation: "From 1914 to 1918, millions of French and millions of Germans were having a jolly time, peacefully enjoying the usual pleasures of life without trying to kill anyone"? It might sound clever to make such an exact statement but, put back in its context, it would a wrong correction of the above statement according to which French and Germans were at war.

I am afraid of the Jews. David Irving also is afraid of the Jews. "Metus Judaeorum" is to be found in a great many times, places and individuals. I have never criticised people for being afraid of bringing on the famous wrath of the Jews ("Ira Judaeorum"). I have never criticised David Irving, "the reluctant revisionist" as I call him, for not taking such or such revisionist stand since, in his own words, it would be like putting his head on the Jewish block (this he told me in London in 1991 when he invited Leuchter and myself to speak in Chelsea). What I do criticise are people who, in my opinion, go too far in their fear of the Jews. For example, although I have been physically assaulted ten times by Jews, although they have dragged me into court so often, although they have destroyed the life of my wife and of my three children, although my family and I have had to give them so much money by order of the courts, although they got the French Parliament to pass in 1990 a special law in order to protect their cherished Gigantic Lie, although they are having my dearest friend Ernst Zündel held in prison in abominable conditions, although they behave like whining persecutors and treat the Palestinians in the way you see they do with their "Jewish Army" in a "Jewish State" (please, note "Jewish"), I would never, albeit in the face of so terrible a power, bow my head and declare:

"The Germans seem to be of a different personality [from the English and other civilised peoples] and I'm afraid I have to agree to a certain extent with that author, Daniel Goldhagen, who wrote a book suggesting that the German mentality is somewhat different" (in Australia, "Ron Casey [Radio 2 GB] talks with David Irving", 8 November 1998, as reported in *Adelaide Institute Online*, December 1996, p. 17).

And never, in order to placate those who call me a Nazi, would I use in court or elsewhere what D. Irving calls his trump card and which is nothing but a fake: the "Brunns Report" as he dubs it.

You find D. Irving to be courageous. Yes indeed, compared with some revisionists, he shows some courage, but watch him, it is the kind of courage which comes and goes and even, sometimes, as soon as he shows some intrepidity, he hastens to pull back all the more. This I found to be the case in different circumstances in Washington, in Munich and in London. I am pleased when he shows some courage, I feel pity for him when he pulls back and I smile when he presents himself as a hero.

I, for one, am afraid of the Jewish power but, when I have an important decision to make for revisionism's sake, I ignore the Jews and their usual theatrics. Which should be considered as normal and certainly not heroic.

I feel sorry for you, Michael. While reading some of your writings I have often thought: "Jews should make Kamerad Hoffman Chief Rabbi *honoris causa*" but, see, they instead call you a Nazi! Like Faurisson and so many others!

Now *re* Horst Mahler: by "Reich" he means "German Reich" or "German Nation" and not "Third Reich". Anyway, must I repeat that I do not care about his real or supposed political ideas but rather about his idea of what I call a "Revisionist ADL"?

May I expect you to defend the human rights of those persecuted for their ideas?

Best wishes. Robert

PS: "Apollonian" (see Walter Mueller's last message) is mistaken. My quote about the Zündel trial's (or trials') of 1985 and 1988 having been "a didactic failure" does not come from a revisionist but from a Holocaustorian. In other words, those trials may in fact be considered by us revisionists as a victory.

20 November 2003

This text has been displayed on the Net, and forwarded to you as a tool for educational purpose, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Recits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (AAARGH). The E-mail of the Secretariat is <[aaarghinternational - at - hotmail.com](mailto:aaarghinternational-at-hotmail.com)>. Mail can be sent at PO Box 81475, Chicago, IL 60681-0475, USA..

We see the act of displaying a written document on Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical question apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in those places: they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by the Human Rights Charter:

ARTICLE 19. <Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.>The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.

[aaarghinternational - at - hotmail.com](mailto:aaarghinternational-at-hotmail.com)

| [Accueil général](#) | [Homepage English](#) | [Faurisson Archive](#) | [Archive Faurisson](#) |

You downloaded this document from <<http://vho.org/aaargh/engl/FaurisArch/RF031120.html>>